



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/927,593	08/10/2001	Seok-Hyo Park	678-717 (P9753)	8186

7590

06/17/2005

Paul J. Farrell, Esq.
DILWORTH & BARRESE, LLP
333 Earle Ovington Blvd.
Uniondale, NY 11553

EXAMINER

ELAHEE, MD S

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2645

DATE MAILED: 06/17/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/927,593

Applicant(s)

PARK, SEOK-HYO

Examiner

Md S. Elahee

Art Unit

2645

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 03 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 January 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 1/10/05, 2/22/05
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments mailed on 01/03/05 have been fully considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection which is deemed appropriate to address all of the needs at this time.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1, 4-6 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kumar (U.S. Pub. No. 2005/0060154) in view of Krishnakumar et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,014,087).

Regarding claim 1, Kumar teaches transmitting a connection [i.e., link connection] request message to the slave upon request of a connection with the slave (page 3, paragraph 0025).

Kumar further teaches determining whether the link is connected (page 3, paragraph 0025).

However, Kumar does not specifically teach "transmitting the link connection request message as many times as a predetermined number of automatic link connection attempts until the link is connected if the link is not connected". Krishnakumar teaches transmitting the

connection [i.e., link connection] request message as many times as a predetermined number of automatic connection attempts until the link is connected if the link is not connected (fig.2; col.3, line 64-col.4, line 12). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Kumar to transmit the link connection request message as many times as a predetermined number of automatic link connection attempts until the link is connected if the link is not connected as taught by Krishnakumar. The motivation for the modification is to have doing so in order to make connection with the destination without having any inconvenience.

Regarding claims 4 and 6 are rejected for the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 1. Furthermore, Kumar teaches a method of automatically connecting a link between a communication terminal equipped with a Bluetooth wireless device acting as a master and a communication terminal equipped with a Bluetooth wireless device acting as a slave (page 3, paragraphs 0024, 0025).

Kumar teaches transmitting a message indicating a connection request [i.e., predetermined automatic link connection attempt] number to the slave by the master (page 3, paragraph 0025).

Kumar further teaches receiving the message indicating the automatic link connection attempt from the master (page 3, paragraph 0025).

However, Kumar does not specifically teach “message indicating the automatic link connection attempt number” and “setting the automatic link connection attempt number in the slave by the slave”. Krishnakumar teaches message indicating the automatic link connection attempt number and setting the automatic link connection attempt number in the voice station

Art Unit: 2645

[i.e., slave] by the voice station (fig.1, 2; col.2, lines 9-15, col.3, line 64-col.4, line 12). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Kumar to incorporate message indicating the automatic link connection attempt number and setting the automatic link connection attempt number in the slave by the slave as taught by Krishnakumar. The motivation for the modification is to have doing so in order to make connection with the destination within a predetermined number of attempts without having any inconvenience.

Kumar further teaches attempting a connection [i.e., link connection attempt] to the master by the slave (page 3, paragraph 0025).

Regarding claim 5, Kumar does not specifically teach “the master transmits the message indicating the number of automatic link connection attempts every time the master connects a link with the slave”. Krishnakumar teaches that the sending voice station [i.e., master] transmits the message indicating the number of automatic link connection attempts every time the sending voice station connects a link with the receiving voice station [i.e., slave] (fig.1, 2; col.2, lines 9-15, col.3, line 64-col.4, line 12). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Kumar to incorporate the master transmitting the message indicating the number of automatic link connection attempts every time the master connects a link with the slave as taught by Krishnakumar. The motivation for the modification is to have doing so in order to maintain a count of attempts per connection.

Regarding claim 8 is rejected for the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 6. Furthermore, Kumar teaches that the communication terminal acting as a slave applies

Art Unit: 2645

the automatic link connection attempt by the master as long as the communication terminal acts as the slave (page 3, paragraph 0025).

4. Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kumar (U.S. Pub. No. 2005/0060154) in view of Krishnakumar et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,014,087) further in view of Ziniel (U.S. Patent No. 5,390,341).

Regarding claim 2, Kumar does not specifically teach “sounding an alarm indicating a link connection failure and notifying a link connection failure message if the link is not connected after the link connection request message is transmitted more times than the automatic link connection attempt number”. Krishnakumar teaches sounding an alarm indicating a link connection failure and notifying a link connection failure message if the link is not connected after the link connection request message is transmitted more times than the automatic link connection attempt number (fig.2; col.4, line 13-33). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Kumar to sounding an alarm indicating a link connection failure and notifying a link connection failure message if the link is not connected after the link connection request message is transmitted more times than the automatic link connection attempt number as taught by Krishnakumar. The motivation for the modification is to have doing so in order to send the status of connection so that a master can make another attempt if necessary.

However, Kumar in view of Krishnakumar does not specifically teach “displaying a link connection failure message if the link is not connected”. Ziniel teaches displaying a link connection failure message if the link is not connected (col.4, lines 33-42). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify

Art Unit: 2645

Kumar in view of Krishnakumar to display a link connection failure message if the link is not connected as taught by Ziniel. The motivation for the modification is to have doing so in order to display the connection status to the user.

5. Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kumar (U.S. Pub. No. 2005/0060154) in view of Krishnakumar et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,014,087) further in view of Hunzinger (U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0065071) and in view of Sharma et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0223461).

Regarding claim 3, Kumar in view of Krishnakumar does not specifically teach “a message requesting input of the automatic link connection attempt number upon receipt of key input selecting an automatic link connection menu, setting the automatic link connection attempt number corresponding to a received digit key, and setting an automatic link connection mode”. Hunzinger teaches an option (i.e., message) requesting input of the automatic link connection attempt number upon receipt of key input selecting an automatic link connection menu, setting the automatic link connection attempt number corresponding to a received digit key, and setting an automatic link connection mode (page 7, paragraph 0076). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Kumar in view of Krishnakumar to incorporate a message requesting input of the automatic link connection attempt number upon receipt of key input selecting an automatic link connection menu, setting the automatic link connection attempt number corresponding to a received digit key, and setting an automatic link connection mode as taught by Hunzinger. The motivation for the modification is to have doing so in order to make connection based on the input message from the user according to the user's own choice.

However, Kumar in view of Krishnakumar further in view of Hunzinger does not specifically teach “displaying a message requesting input of the automatic link connection attempt number”. Sharma teaches displaying a message requesting input of the automatic link connection attempt number (page 21, paragraph 0275). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Kumar in view of Krishnakumar further in view of Hunzinger to display a message requesting input of the automatic link connection attempt number as taught by Sharma. The motivation for the modification is to have doing so in order to display an option to the user to set a number of attempts to send a fax.

6. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kumar (U.S. Pub. No. 2005/0060154) in view of Krishnakumar et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,014,087) further in view of Kobayashi (U.S. Patent No. 6,721,564).

Regarding claims 7 and 17, Kumar teaches transmitting a message indicating a connection attempt to the slave by the master (page 3, paragraph 0025).

However, Kumar does not specifically teach “message indicating a changed automatic link connection attempt number, the message indicating the change from the slave, if the automatic link connection attempt number is changed”. Krishnakumar teaches a message indicating a changed automatic link connection attempt number, the message indicating the change from the receiving voice station [i.e., slave], if the automatic link connection attempt number is changed (fig. 1, 2; col.2, lines 9-15, col.3, line 64-col.4, line 12). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify

Art Unit: 2645

Kumar to have a message indicating a changed automatic link connection attempt number, the message indicating the change from the slave, if the automatic link connection attempt number is changed as taught by Krishnakumar. The motivation for the modification is to have doing so in order to update the number of connection attempts.

Kumar in view of Krishnakumar does not specifically teach “transmitting a message to the slave by the master until the master receives a response message”. Kobayashi teaches transmitting a message to the base station (i.e., slave) by the mobile communication terminal (i.e., master) until the mobile communication terminal receives a response message (col.2, line 61- col.3, line 10). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Kumar in view of Krishnakumar to transmit a message to the slave by the master until the master receives a response message as taught by Kobayashi. The motivation for the modification is to have doing so in order to get the acknowledgement of the receipt of the transmitted message.

Conclusion

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Moon et al. (US Patent No. 6,804,532) teach System and method for re-routing communications based on wireless communication link quality, Wang et al. (US Pub. No. 2002/0026474) teach Thin client for wireless device using java interface and Arazi et al. (US Pub. No. 2004/0009749) teach Wireless private branch exchange(wpbx) and communicating between mobile units and base stations.

Art Unit: 2645


8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Md S. Elahee whose telephone number is (571) 272-7536. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon to Fri from 8:30am to 5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Fan Tsang can be reached on (571) 272-7547. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

M.E.

MD SHAFIUL ALAM ELAHEE
June 5, 2005


FAN TSANG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600